Chronology of the Sēna Kings of Bengal.—*By* NAGĒNDRA-NĀTHA VASU.

(Read January, 1896).

The history of the Sēna kings occupies an important and prominent position in that of Bengal. Considerable research has, from time to time, been made by Hindu and foreign scholars to discover materials from which to construct a genuine history of this dynasty, and though much light has been thrown on the subject by the discovery and decipherment of inscriptions much yet remains to be done.

My new materials are a hitherto unpublished inscription, which I have discovered at Madanapāḍa in Farīdpur, some old works on brahmanic genealogy of considerable historical value, and some ancient manuscripts. These materials will serve to correct the chronology and dynastic links of these rulers as set forth by previous inquirers; a summary of which, for easy reference, is here given.

A. James Prinsep stands first in this field of inquiry. He gives, as the result of his researches, the following list of Sēna kings in chronological order:—

A.D.

1063. Vijaya-sēna (Sukha-sēna).
1066. Ballāla-sēna.
1116. Lakṣmaṇa-sēna.
1123. Mādhava-sēna.
1133. Kēçava-sēna.
1151. Sadā-sēna or Sura-sēna.
1154. Naujēb or Nārāyaṇa.
1200. Lakṣmaṇya (the last.)[1]

B. Dr. Rājendralāla Mitra, after further inquiries, supports Mr. Prinsep. He had certain inscriptions of Vijaya-sēna, Lakṣmaṇa-sēna, Kēçava-sēna and Açōka of Gayā before him, and gave the

[1] See *J. A. S. B.*, 1838, pt. I, p. 41; and Prinsep's *Indian Antiquities* (Ed. Thomas), Vol. II, p. 272.

following succession of kings in Eastern and littoral Bengal with initial years of their reigns. [1]

In Eastern and littoral Bengal:—

A.D.		
986.	I.	Vīra-sēna.
1006.	II.	Sāmanta-sēna.
1026.	III.	Hēmanta-sēna.
In the whole of Bengal:—		
1046.	IV.	Vijaya *alias* Sukha-sēna.
1056.	V.	Ballāla-sēna.
1106.	VI.	Lakṣmaṇa-sēna.
1136.	VII.	Mādhava-sēna.
1138.	VIII.	Kēçava-sēna.
1142.	IX.	Açōka-sēna.
In Vikramapur.		
		Ballāla-sēna.
		Su-sēna.
		Sura-sēna, &c.

C. Sir Alexander Cunningham on the authority of the inscriptions of Deopāḍā, Tarpaṇadīghi, Bākargañj and of the *Āīn-i-Akbarī* gives a fresh list. [2]

A.D.	
650.	Vīra-sēna, from whom descended
975.	Sāmanta-sēna.
1000.	Hēmanta-sēna.
1025.	Vijaya-sēna or Sukha-sēna.
1050.	Ballāla-sēna.
1076.	Lakṣmaṇa-ṣēna.
1106.	Mādhava-sēna.
1108.	Kēçava-sēna.
1118.	Lākṣmaṇēya (reigned 80 years.—*Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*).
1198.	Conquest of Bengal by Bakhtiār Khiljī.[3]

Sir Alexander makes also the following remarks with reference to certain princes of this dynasty:—

'Now just as we have seen in the case of Gō-pāla, the progenitor of the Pāla Rājās, who is also called by the synonymous names of Bhū-pāla

[1] See *J. A. S. B.*, Vol. XXXIV. pt. I, p. 128, XLVII. pt. I, p. 396; and Mitra's *Indo-Aryans*, Vol. II. p. 262.

[2] Rep. Arch. Sur. XV. p. 158. In a note on the subject he writes: 'As A.D. 1107 was the first year after the expiry of Lakṣmaṇa's reign, his death must have taken place in A.D. 1106.'

and Lōka-pāla, so I believe that Vīra-sēna may have been also known as Sura-sēna. This prince I would identify with king Sura-sēna, who married the princess Bhōga-dēvī, the sister of Aṁçu-varmā Rājā of Nēpāla, who was the contemporary of Hiuen Tsiang, and of whom Pandit Bhagawān-lāl Indrajī has published inscriptions, dated in A.D. 645 and 651. In No. 14 of these Nēpāl records, the son of Sura and Bhōga-dēvī is named Bhōga-varmā, while in another record (No. 15) he is said to be the son of the great Āditya-sēna, the illustrious Lord of Magadha. Hence it seems probable that the later Sēna Rājās of Bengal were the direct descendants of Āditya-sēna-dēva, the great king of Magadha.'

Dr. Rājēndralāla Mitra again comes out with the observation that 'Vīra-Sēna' mentioned in the inscription of Vijaya-sēna, the founder of the Sēna Dynasty, was no other than Ādiçūra, who brought five Brāhmaṇas and five Kāyasthas from Kanauj.' [1]

D. Dr. Hoernle, in his Review of the Sēna Kings of Bengal, says:—

'It was Vijaya-sēna, who, after defeating the king of the Pāla Dynasty of Gauḍa, became the first king of Bengal, and his predecessors, Sāmanta and Hēmanta, were rulers of some territories in Pauṇḍra-vardhana, at a time when Nārāyaṇa-pāla reigned in Bengal, between the years A.D. 1006 and 1026.'

He says further that 'Vijaya-sēna's other name was Ādiçūra' [2] and adds:—

'It was probably the successor of the latter (Nārāyaṇa-pāla), who was supplanted in the Bengal kingdom by Vijaya-sēna (or Sukha-sēna), the first Bengal king (though the fourth in descent) of the Sēna family, whose date is about A.D. 1030.' [3]

E. In a Bengali work, [4] the author Babu Mahimā-candra Mazūmdār gives his view of the subject thus: 'The *Āīn-i-Akbarī* gives the commencement of the reign of Ballāla-sēna in 1066 A.D., and Mr. Prinsep accepts this; but in respect of the ancient rulers of Gauḍa, the Āīn cannot be relied upon as an authority. The writer (presumably Dr. Rājēndralāla Mitra) of an article in the Rahasya Sandarbha, believing the year of this event to be Çaka 1019, supports his statement by a citation from the *Samaya-prakāça*, which, however, as a matter of fact indicates the year as Çaka 1091.' . . . . Assuming A.D. 1066 as the correct year of Ballāla-sēna's accession to the throne and A.D. 1203 as the year in which his son lost it, the difference would be 137 years—a

1 See Mitra's *Indo-Aryans*, Vol. II. p. 241.

2 Centenary Review of the Researches of the Society, 1784–1883, pp. 209–10.

3 *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XIV. p. 165.

4 गौड़े ब्राह्मण (Brahmaṇs in Gauḍa). pp. 90 and ff.

period which the writer of the above article considers too long for the reign of only two successive kings; he therefore makes Lakṣmaṇa-sēna as the great grandson of Ballāla-sēna, the same who was defeated by Bakhtiār Khiljī. He further adds :—' Let us suppose that Ballāla wrote the Dāna-sāgara in Çaka 1091 (A.D. 1169), and died two or three years later, when Lakṣmaṇa, an elderly person, ascended the throne which he lost after a reign of 25 or 30 years in 1203 A.D. This according to Minhāju-d-dīn happened on the king's attaining his 80th year. If it be true it indicates no doubt old age; but there is no certainty about it . . . . . The two copper-plate grants by Lākṣmaṇa-sēna—one to Īçvara-candra-dēva-çarmā and the other to Kṛṣṇa-dhara-dēva-çarmmā—bear respectively the dates 3rd Bhadra, year 7, and 10th Māgha, year 2. These years are believed to be those of the Lakṣmaṇa era. An era may commence from the date of the birth of a prince, from that of his appointment as an heir-apparent, from that of the actual commencement of his reign, or from that of any important event. The Lakṣmaṇa era, it is evident from the copper-plates did not commence from the time of his birth, but dates either from his inauguration as the prince elect, or from his accession to the throne of Gauḍa.'[1]

F. In an able article on the era of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna[2] Mr. Beveridge says :—

'The last Hindu king of Bengal mentioned in the Abū-l-faẓl's list (*Āīn*, p. 413, *Bibliotheca Indica* edition) is Rājā Nōjah, who ruled three years. This is the Rājā Noe or Najah of Gladwin, for he has both spellings, and the Rājāh Bhōja of Lassen. Abū-l-faẓl says that when Rājā Nōjā died the kingdom passed to Lakṣmaṇa who ruled at Nadiā and was expelled by Bakhtiār Khiljī (*Āīn*, p. 414). In my humble opinion this Lakṣmaṇa is the Lachman-sēna of the *Akbar-nāma* and the prince who gave his name to the Lakṣmaṇ era.

G. Dr. Kielhorn in his article on the Deō-pārā Inscription of Vijaya-sēna in *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. I. (1892), thus writes on the subject :—

'According to Dr. Rājēndralāla Mitra. (Notices of Sanskrit MSS. Vol. I, p. 151) Ballāla-sēna in the Dāna-sāgara calls himself the son of Vijaya-sēna and grandson of Hēmanta-sēna, and according to the same authority, the Dāna-sāgara was composed in A. D. 1097. The statement I am unable to verify.........Vijaya-sēna is eulogised as having defeated and imprisoned besides others, the Kings Nānya and Vīra (page 306). Nānya we find again (as was first pointed out to me by Dr. Burgess) in Nānya-

[1] गौड़े ब्राह्मण pp. 90–96.

[2] *J. A. S. B.*, Vol. LVII. Pt. I, p. 5.

dēva, the founder of the Karṇāṭaka Dynasty of Nēpāl, who is placed in Çaka 1019=A. D. 1097, close enough to the time when our inscription was composed to suggest the idea that he may possibly be the very king here spoken of' (p. 313). 'Lakṣmaṇa-sēna was the founder of an era which undoubtedly, dates from the beginning of his reign, and which as I have tried to show elsewhere commenced in A. D. 1119' (pages 306-7). [1]

After giving this resumé of the opinions of all the writers on the subject, I now proceed to show on what grounds I have been obliged to differ from them on many important points.

I. In a manuscript copy of the Dāna-sāgara obtained by me from Assam, I find Ballāla-sēna thus speaking of himself:—

हेमन्तः परिपन्थिपङ्कजसरः सर्गस्य नैसर्गिकै-
रुद्गीतः स्वगणैरुदात्तमहिमा हेमन्तसेनोऽजनि ।
तदनु विजयसेनः प्रादुरासीद् वरेन्द्रे
दिशि विदिशि भजन्ते यस्य वीरध्वजत्वम् ॥
दैन्योत्तापभृतामकालजलदः सर्व्वोत्तरः क्ष्माभृतां
श्रीबल्लालनृपस्ततो ऽजनि गुणाविर्भावगर्भेश्वरः ।

Like Hēmanta (the cold season) which is fatal to the growth of lotuses, Hēmanta-sēna the destroyer of his enemies, who was celebrated for his natural qualities and whose greatness was highly spoken of by his kinsmen, was born.

After him Vijaya-sēna flourished in Varēndra, whose eminence amongst the heroes was praised far in all directions ....

After him the king Ballāla-sēna, the head of the kings, a king from his birth, and clad in all good qualities, was born, like an untimely cloud towards those who were suffering from the keen heat (distress) of penury.

II. The old kārikā by Hari-miçra-ghaṭaka obtained by me from the Ghaṭakas of Ēdilpur, states as follows:—

पञ्चगौडाधिपस्यास्य स्पर्द्धा काशीश्वरेण च ।
सम्मानेन च दानेन काशीश्वरमधःकृतः ॥
किन्तु साग्निर्महाद्यापि विप्राद्यैर्विकला सभा ।
मनस्वी तेन भूपोऽयं भूदेवैर्निन्द्यराज्यकः ।
मतिश्चक्रे तदानेतुं गौडराज्ये द्विजोत्तमान् ॥

[1] *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XIX.

कोलाञ्चदेशतः पञ्च विप्रा ज्ञानतपोयुताः ।
महाराजादिशूरेण समानीताः सपत्नीकाः ॥
क्षितीश मेधातिथि च वीतरागः सुधानिधिः ।
सौभरिः स च धर्म्मात्मा आगता गौडमण्डले ॥
इति पञ्च समाख्याताः राज्ञा तेन परीक्षिताः ।
कामठी ब्रह्मपुरी च हरिकोटस्तथैव च ॥
कङ्कग्रामो वटग्राम एषां स्थानानि पञ्च च ।
एषाञ्च बहवः पुत्रास्तपोनिर्धूतकल्मषाः ॥
भूपालैः पूजिता ये च धनैर्ग्रामैस्तथोत्तमैः ।
महावंशप्रसूतास्ते ब्राह्मणापूजिता नृपैः ॥

× × × × × ×

क्ष्मापालप्रतिभूर्भुवः पतिरभूद् गौडे च राष्ट्रे ततः
राजाऽभूत् प्रबलः सदैव शरणः श्रीदेवपालस्ततः ।
प्रज्ञा-वाक्य-विवेक-शील-विनयैः शुद्धाशयः श्रीयुतो
धर्म्मे चास्य मतिः सदैव रमते स स्वीयवंशोद्भवे ॥'

× × × × × × ×

'विप्रपालो हि बल्लालो राजा विजयनन्दनः ।
ब्राह्मणाय कुलस्थानं दत्तवान् भुवि दुर्लभम् ॥
ताम्रपात्रे कुलं लेख्य शासनानि बहूनि च ।
एतेभ्यो दत्तवान् पूर्व्वं कलौ बल्लालसेनकः ॥
बल्लालतनयो राजा लक्ष्मणो ऽभून्महाशयः ।
जन्मग्रहभयाद्दोषात् कलङ्कोऽभूदनन्तरम् ॥
प्रायश्चित्तं ततः कृत्वा ब्राह्मणेभ्यः प्रतिग्रहात् ।
तत्पुत्त्रः केशवो राजा गौडराज्यं विहाय च ॥
मतिञ्चाप्यकरोद्द्वन्द्वे यवनस्य भयात्ततः ।
न शक्नुवन्ति ते विप्रास्तत्र स्थातुं यदा पुनः ॥

Mahārāja Ādi-çūra was ruler of the five Gauḍas. The king of Kāçī (Benares) was his rival. The great veneration in which Ādi-çūra was held and his various acts of charity made even the king of Kāçī to blush. Ādi-çūra, however, was anxious on one account. He had not

got a Sāgnika[1] Brāhmaṇa in his court, and he made up his mind to bring some from elsewhere. Accordingly, he brought from Kōlāñca five Brāhmaṇas full of wisdom and devotion to God, *viz.*, Kṣitīça, Mēdhātithi, Vīta-rāga, Sudhā-nidhi, and Saubhari. They came to Gauḍa with their families. The king, after testing their merits, gave them each one of five villages, *viz.*, Kāmaṭhi, Brahmapurī, Harikōṭa, Kaŋkagrāma, and Baṭagrāma to live in. The Brāhmaṇas, whom Ādi-çūra and his descendants thus honoured by grants of villages and presents of money, were descended from respectable families, and the kings who succeeded them accorded similar honour to their progeny.

After Ādi-çūra, his descendants occupied the throne of Gauḍa for some time. By Divine favour Dēva-pāla became a powerful ruler. He was wise, conscientious, meek, humble and pure. He always paid a special regard to the religious observances ordained in his Dynasty.
* * * * * * * * Ballāla-sēna, the son of Vijaya-sēna, always endeavoured to support the Brāhmaṇas. He honoured the Brāhmaṇas with the superior rank of Kaulīnya—a rank, the equal of which is rarely to be met with in this world. Formerly in the Kali-yuga, Ballāla-sēna had made several copper-plate grants to Brāhmaṇas.
* * * * * * Lakṣmaṇa-sēna, the son of Ballāla-sēna reaped disrepute consequent on the fear entertained by him, because of his having been born at an inauspicious moment. His son Kēçava left the kingdom of Gauḍa; the fear of the Yavanas having compelled him to fight with them. At this time the Brāhmaṇas were not able to reside there any longer.

III. In the Kārikā (account of kulīna families) by Ēḍū-miçra, it is stated:—

आस्ते पश्चिमदिग्विशेषविषयः श्रीकान्यकुब्जाह्वयः
तन्मध्येऽस्ति विशिष्टविप्रनिलयः कोलाञ्चदेशः शुभः ।
तस्मादानयादादिशूरनृपतिः पूर्व्वन्तु पञ्चद्विजान्
तानानीय विशिष्ट पञ्च नगरं तेभ्यो ददौ गौडतः ॥
काले भूरि तिथौ गते समभवद्बल्लालसेनो नृपः ।
संप्रत्यर्पणादित्सया द्विजगणान् स्तानानयत्स्वान्तिकं ॥

There is a province in the west named Kānya-kubja (kanauj). In it is a blessed place named Kōlāñca, the residence of pious Brāhmanas. Mahārāja Ādi-çūra brought from that place five Brāhmaṇas and gave them five villages for their residence.

[1] Sāgnika, *lit.* possessing or maintaining fire. Sāgnika Brāhmaṇa means a priest who maintains a sacred fire, one who sacrifices according to Vedic rules.

After a long time Ballāla-sēna became the ruler of Gauḍa. He brought Brāhmaṇas to his court in order to honour them with presents.

IV. On page 220 of the said Dāna-sāgara it is written:—

अत्र संवत्सरादिसमयविशेषप्रतिपादनेन दानसागरस्य निर्म्माणकालस्यैव संवत्सरत्वप्रतिपादनाय लिख्यते—

निखिल-चक्रतिलक-श्रीमद्बल्लालसेनेन पूर्णे
शशिनवदशमिते शकवर्षे दानसागरो रचितः।
रविभगणाः शरशिष्टा ये भूता दानसागरस्यास्य।
क्रमशोऽत्र संपरिदानुदाद्या वत्सरा पञ्च॥
तदेवमेकनवत्यधिकवर्षसहस्रारे ऽन्विते शाके
संवत्सराः पतन्ति विश्वपदारभ्य च।

For the purpose of fixing the year of the composition of the Dāna-sāgara, it is necessary to describe the Samvatsara and other periods of times.

The Dāna-sāgara has been composed by the blessed Ballāla-sēna, the crown of all emperors.

When 1091 years expired from the Çaka-rāja the Ravi-yuga-bhagaṇa was thus:—

Years of the	Satya-yuga	1,728,000
,, ,,	Trētā-yuga	1,296,000
,, ,,	Dvāpara-yuga	864,000

At the above Çaka-year the Ravi-bhagaṇa year of the Kali-yuga was 4270. Adding these four numbers we get 38,92,270. Dividing this Ravi-yuga-bhagaṇa by 5, there is no remainder or it is zero. This must be regarded as the commencement of the period of the composition of the work. At this time Saṁvatsara, Parivatsara, Idvatsara, Anuvatsara and Udāvatsara—these five sorts of years had all equally expired.

V. Besides the above, the copper-plate grant of Mahārāja Viçva-rūpa-sēna-dēva, lately discovered, sets forth the following facts:—

अवातरदयान्वये महति तत्र देवः स्वयं
सुधाकिरणशेखरो विजयसेन इत्याख्यया।
खेलत्खड्गलतापमार्ज्जनक्षत-प्रत्यर्थिदर्पज्वर-
स्तस्मादप्रतिमल्लकीर्त्तिरभवद्बल्लालसेनो नृपः॥
\+ + + + + + + +

तस्माल्लक्ष्मणसेनभूपतिरभूद्भूलोककल्पद्रुमः ।
पूर्व्वं जन्मशतेषु भूमिपतिना सन्त्यज्य मुक्तिग्रहं
नूनं तेन सुतार्थिना सुरधुनीतीरे हरः प्रीणितः ॥
एतस्मात् कथमन्यथा रिपुवधूवैधव्यबद्धव्रतो
विख्यात-क्षितिपाल-मौलिरभवत् श्रीविश्वरूपो नृपः ॥

In that pure and extensive Lunar Dynasty, the Lord Çaçı-çēkhara (Moon-crested Çiva) himself was born under the name of Vijaya-sēna. * * * * The son of the said Vijaya-sēna was Ballāla-sēna, the sight of whose weapons in the battlefield drove away from his enemies the pride of their valour. From him sprang Lakṣmaṇa-sēna, a Kalpa-druma in the world. The renowned Viçva-rūpa who occupied the foremost place among the kings of his time sprang from Lakṣmaṇa-sēna. The principal aim of his life was to subject the wives of his enemies to widowhood.

VI. In another place of the same kārikā of Ēḍū-miçra, it is related:—

नृपं तं केशवो भूपतिः
सैन्यैर्विप्रगणैः पितामहकृतैरन्यैश्च युक्तो गतः ॥
तां चक्रे नृपतिर्महादरतया सम्मानयन् जीविकां
तद्वर्गस्य च तस्य च प्रथमतश्चक्रे प्रतिष्ठान्वितः ।
क्ष्मापालः स च केशवं नरपतिं किञ्चित् प्रसङ्गान्तरे
वाक्यं प्राह तदा पितामहः कृती बल्लालसेनो नृपः ॥
कीदृग् विप्रकुलाकुलादिनियमः कस्मात् कथं वा कुतः
केनोद्योगभरेण विप्रनिकरं चक्रे तदाख्याहि मे ।
तं श्रुत्वा कुलपण्डितं कथयितुं तत्तज्जगादादरात्
एडूमिश्रमशेषशास्त्रमखिलं विप्रं प्रथापारगम् ॥

Kēçava accompanied by all the soldiers, the Brāhmaṇas established by his grandfather, and others went to him (the king). The famous king received them with great honour, and provided him (Kēçava) and his followers with means for their maintenance. Once in the way of conversation, he asked Kēçava what was the Kulīna-system of Brāhmaṇas established by the grandfather, the pious Ballāla-sēna, and why, whence, where, and by what enterprise, he created the Brāhmaṇas (new). Hearing this Kēçava ordered his family-bard Ēḍū-miçra, who

was a brāhmaṇa by caste and conversant with all the Çāstras and the religious rites for Brāhmaṇas, to answer the questions of the king.

From the authorities quoted above we cull the following :—

1. That Vijaya-sēna, the son of Hēmauta-sēna, dwelt, after his father, in Varēndra-bhūmi as its king.

2-3. That Ādi-çūra brought from Kolāñca five Brāhmaṇas; that he lived long before Mahārāja Ballāla-sēna, the son of Vijaya, flourished; that after the reign of the Dynasty of Ādi-çūra, Dēva-pāla of the Pāla Dynasty reigned in Gauḍa ; the Sēna kings flourished long after him ; that Ballāla-sēna made several copper-plate grants ; that Lakṣmaṇa-sēna fell into disrepute owing to the time of his birth having been inauspicious ; that Kēçava-sēna was the son of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna and that the fear of the Yavanas compelled him to run away, relinquishing his father's kingdom.

4. That Ballāla-sēna lived in Çaka 1091, *i. e.*, A. D. 1169.

5. That a powerful king, named Viçva-rūpa-sēna, was the son of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna, the son of Ballāla-sēna and that the copper-plate grant was made in the 14th year of his reign.

6. That Kēçava-sēna (after the capture of Gauḍa) lived under the protection of a king.

Taking into consideration the facts now brought to light, I do not see how we can accept the statement made by Sir Alexander Cunningham, as to the Sēna kings of Bengal having descended from Āditya-sēna of the Gupta Dynasty of the Magadha kings ; or that made by Dr. Rājēndralāla Mitra and others as to Vīra-sēna or Vijaya-sēna being identical with Ādi-çūra.

The date of Ballāla's coronation 1066 A. D., as given by Prinsep and Dr. Mitra is not borne out by the Āīn-i-Akbarī, which they quote as their authority, while the Akbar-nāma, as first pointed out by Mr. Beveridge, gives the initial date of the Lakṣmaṇa era as 1119. Dr. Kielhorn has supported this statement. But they believe that the Lakṣmaṇa era commenced from the year of his coronation. The statement is not borne out by the facts now brought to light. Although the Lakṣmaṇa era commenced from the year 1119 A. D., it was not the year in which he was installed. I have already shown that in Çaka 1091, *i. e.* 1169 A. D. Mahārāja Ballāla-sēna-dēva composed his work Dāna-sāgara, and even in that year he gave himself out as king of Gauḍa. Ballāla, having been on the throne at that time, it follows that Lakṣmaṇa could not have been the ruler of Gauḍa at the same time. Between the years 1119 and 1169 there elapsed a period of 50 years, and it is mentioned in the Āīn-i-Akbarī that Ballāla-sēna ruled Bengal for that period. If any reliance can be placed on this statement it must be admitted that 1119 A.D. was the

year of Ballāla-sēna's coronation. Now it may be contended that Lakṣmaṇa-sēna was installed as Prince-elect and for that reason the era commenced from that time. But even this cannot be taken as correct. Hindu kings, generally speaking, nominate their sons as Prince elect at the close of their career, and numerous instances in support of this statement can be cited from works of antiquity.

Keeping this in view, it must be accepted that Ballāla-sēna was 50 or 60 years old when he began to reign in the year 1119 A.D., and in that case, at the time he wrote his Dāna-sāgara, he was 100 or 110 years old. But we have not heard of any king of Bengal having lived to such an old age. It is therefore evident that at the time of Ballāla-sēna's coronation, Lakṣmaṇa-sēna was not nominated as Prince Elect.

There is a tradition extant that at the time when Ballāla-sēna set out on his expedition to conquer Mithilā, news of his death spread abroad; and that at that time Lakṣmaṇa-sēna was born, and was immediately installed on the throne. It is probable that the Muhammadan historian Minhāj's wonderful story was based on this tradition. Be that as it may, the tradition leads us to the inference that, soon after ascending the throne, Ballāla-sēna left his kingdom to conquer Mithilā, and that after achieving success he received news of the birth of a son. [1] This news pleased him so much that in his newly conquered kingdom he inaugurated a new era, which he named the Lakṣmaṇa Era. This era is still extant among the paṇḍits of Mithila; but there is nothing to show that it was introduced into Bengal.

Ballāla-sēna ascended the throne in the year 1119 A.D., so that there can be no doubt that he reigned to a very old age. Moreover, the social reforms effected by him, and the order of kulīnism, which he instituted, must have taken a considerable portion of his life; and this also is a proof of his long reign.

Lakṣmaṇa-sēna, the son of Ballāla-sēna, was very popular with his subjects. He was a learned man and took great delight in honouring the Paṇḍits of his time. Poems composed by him are found in the *Sadukti-karṇāmṛta*, *Çārṅgadhara-paddhati*, *Padyāvali* and other anthologies. Even Maulānā Minhāju-d-dīn has thus written of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna—'Little or much, never did any tyranny proceed from his hand.' [2]

1 प्रवादः श्रूयते चात्र पारम्परीणवार्त्तया।
मिथिले युद्धयाचायां बल्लालो ऽभून्मृतध्वनिः॥
तदानीं विक्रमपुरे लक्ष्मणो जातवानसौ।
लघुभारते २ य खण्डे १४० पृ०।

2 Raverty, *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri*, p. 555.

According to the Āīn-i-Akbarī[1] Lakṣmaṇa reigned only seven years; but this cannot be accepted as correct. Again, according to Minhāj, 'He reigned for a period of eighty years.' On this Mr. Beveridge writes: —

'If then Lakṣmaṇa began to reign in 1119 A.D., and reigned eighty years, this would bring the termination of his Government to 1199 A.D., which is a tolerably close approximation to the dates of the capture of Nadiyā, given by Major Raverty and Sir Alexander Cunningham. If we take Mr. Blochmann's date for that event, viz., 1198 or 1199, there is an almost coincidence between Abū-l-fazl's date of 1119, for the commencement of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna's reign, and the statement in the *Tabaqāt* of Minhāju-d-din that Lakṣmaṇa reigned eighty years.'[2]

I have shown above that Mithilā was conquered by Ballāla-sēna, and that in order to signalise the birth of Lakṣmaṇa a new era was inaugurated in that kingdom. I have also stated that Ballāla-sēna was living in the year 1169. Taking these facts into consideration, neither a reign of 7 years mentioned in the Āīn-i-Akbarī nor one of 80 years, put forward by Minhāj can be attributed to Lakṣmaṇa-sēna. After Ballāla-sēna Lakṣmaṇa-sēna reigned from 1170 to 1198, *i.e.*, 27 or 28 years in all. It is very likely that Abū-l-fazl by mistake put down 7 in place of 27. It is probable that Minhāj while travelling from Delhi on his way to Lakhnautī, through Mithilā, heard that Bengal was conquered in the 80th L.S. and jumped to the conclusion that Lakṣmaṇa must have reigned for 80 years.

Minhāj relates:—

'When he (Maḥammad-i-Bakhtiār) subdued Bihār, his fame had reached the hearing of Rāi-Lakṣmaṇiah, and the different parts of his dominion likewise. A number of astrologers, wise men and counsellors of his kingdom presented themselves before the Rāi and represented, saying: 'In our books of the ancient Brāhmaṇs, they have foretold that this country will fall into the hands of the Turks and the time of its fulfilment has drawn near. The Turks have subjugated Bihār, and next year they will surely come into this country. It is expedient for us that the Rāi should consent so that he, along with the whole people should be removed from the country in order that we may be saved from the molestation of the Turks'[3] 'When they became assured of these peculiarities, most of the Brāhmaṇs and inhabitants of that place left, and retired into the province of Sankanāt, the cities and towns of Baṅg, and towards Kāmrud; but to begin to abandon his country was not agreeable to Rāi Lakṣmaṇiah.'[4]

It appears from a statement made by Minhāj that before Muḥammad-i-Bakhtiār attacked Nadiyā, several Paṇḍits and other residents

[1] Jarrett, *Āīn-i-Akbari*, Vol. II. p. 146.
[2] *J. A. S. B.* 1888, Pt. I. p. 3.
[3] Raverty, *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri*, p. 556.
[4] Raverty, *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri*, p. 557.

relying on the prophecy, left the capital and went to Jagannātha (Purī), East Bengal, and Kāmarūpa (Assam).

Abū-l-fazl has made mention of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna's son Mādhava-sēna having reigned after him for a period of 10 years. Mādhava-sēna does not appear to have ruled Bengal after Lakṣmaṇa. It is likely that during the reign of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna, he was either nominated as Prince Elect or that he ruled the kingdom as regent. In the Sūktikarṇāmrita by Çrīdhara-dāsa, son of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna's favourite Mahāsāmanta Baṭu-dāsa, some of Mādhava-sēna's poetical writings have been inserted. I am inclined to believe that, following the example of the Paṇḍitas and others, Mādhava-sēna also left Bengal and went on a pilgrimage to Kēdāra-nātha. This is borne out by the facts given below.

At a place near the city of Almora in Kumāun, within the Himālaya regions, there is a temple dedicated to Yōgēçvara. This temple contains a copper-plate grant of Mādhava-sēna. Moreover, inside the Balēçvara temple, in the Kēdāra tracts, there is a copper-plate grant dated 1145 Çaka (A. D. 1223), in which the words 'Vaŋgaja-Brāhmaṇa' appear. The name of Rudra-çarmā, Bhaṭṭa-nārayaṇa's descendant, is also inscribed in it. [1]

It can be inferred from the above that Pandits belonging to Bhaṭṭa-nārāyaṇa's family accompanied Mādhava-sēna when he left Bengal on pilgrimage.

A careful perusal of Minhāj's account of the invasion of Bengal by the Turks, quoted above, would lead to show that prior to the event, the officers of the kingdom had made a conspiracy, and that the Musalmāns bribed the Paṇḍits of the Court to help them in forwarding their cause. Had this not been the case, the Paṇḍits of the Court would not have mentioned to the king a prophecy, which did not exist in the çāstras, and advised him to leave the kingdom. But the king showed his manliness by not following the advice of the Paṇḍits. He was nevertheless forced to relinquish it under the following circumstances:—

When taking his dinner, he suddenly heard of his palace having been attacked. He came to know also that, prior to this, his principal Counsellors had left the Court. It might have occurred to him also that the attack by the Turks was the result of a plot made by those officers. Driven to desperation, he knew not what to do at such a juncture. Left by the Counsellors and without any means of defence, what could an old monarch like him do? He could think of no other alternative than to quit the palace by a back-door. It has been stated by some that he went either to Orissa or to East Bengal, and established a kingdom

[1] E. Atkinson, *Kumaun*, p. 516.

there. But the old broken-hearted and depressed king appears to have gone to Jagannātha on pilgrimage. During my travels in Orissa in the year 1893, I was informed by the inhabitants of Kuā̃-pāla in the District of Kaṭak, that Lakṣmaṇa-sēna had resided at that place and that he had built a temple there.

In the extract given above from the Ghaṭaka-kārikā by Hari-miçra it is plainly stated that the fear of a Musalmān attack forced Kēçava-sēna, the son of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna to leave Gauḍa, and in Ēḍū-miçra's account, it is mentioned that Kēçava-sēna lived under the protection of a Rājā. It may be inferred from this, that Kēçava-sēna ruled Gauḍa as regent or governor, when Lakṣmaṇa was too old to rule, and that on hearing of an attack by the Musalmāns he fled towards Vikramapura. Sixty years after the invasion of Nadiyā, Minhāj wrote thus:—'His (Lakṣmaṇa's) descendants up to this time are rulers in the country of Baŋga.'[1] From this we can draw the inference, that even at that time Baŋga (East Bengal of the present times) was not conquered by the Muḥammadans. It is therefore probable that after leaving Gauḍa, Keçava-sēna took the protection of some other Sēna king.

The accounts of the Ghaṭaka-kārikā do not however state plainly who this king was. I am of opinion that he was no other than Viçva-rūpa-dēva, who is mentioned in the newly-discovered copper-plate grant. The historical portion of the facsimile of the copper-plate published by Mr. Prinsep in the name of Kēçava-sēna agrees exactly with the newly-discovered plate. The Paṇḍit who deciphered it made a mistake in taking Kēçava-sēna for Viçva-rūpa. It is much to be regretted that Dr. Rajēndralāla, Sir Alex. Cunningham, and other antiquarians endorsed Mr. Prinsep's statement, so that the mistake made by him remains uncorrected. From what has been stated above, it is evident that the copper-plate discovered by Mr. Prinsep, bearing the year 3 Saṁvat, and, that lately discovered by me, bearing the year 14 Saṁvat, were granted by Viçva-rūpa.[2]

The copper-plate grant of Viçva-rūpa referred to above gives the name of Ballāla-sēna, the son of Vijaya-sēna, that of his son Lakṣmaṇa-sēna, and that of his son Viçva-rūpa; but the name of Mādhava-sēna or Kēçava-sēna does not appear in it. It follows from this that Kēçava-sēna, after Lakṣmaṇa-sēna's departure to Orissa, did not rule. And who can say that the Musalmāns did not pursue Kēçava-sēna up to Vikramapura? It is likely that, at that time, Viçva-rūpa protected East Bengal from the attack of the Musalmāns.

[1] Raverty, *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri*, p. 558.

[2] *Vide* the facsimile of Viçva-rūpa's copper-plate grant of 14 Samvat, and the article on that subject. *Ante* pp. 6 and ff.

Minhāj writes :—

'The parts around about the State of Lakhanāwatī, such as Jāj-nagar, the countries of Baŋg, Kāmrūd, and Tirhut......the whole of that territory named Gauḍa.' In another place he says, 'The territory of Lakhanāwatī has two wings on either side of the river Gaŋg. The western side they call Rāl (Rāḍha), and the city of Lakhanōr lies on that side, and the eastern side they call Barind (Varēndra)' [1]

From the account given by Minhāj, it appears that at the period under notice, Mithilā, Utkala, Rāḍha, Varēndra, Baŋga, and Kāma-rūpa were included in the kingdom of Gauḍa. The Sēna kings of Bengal ruled over these territories, and for this reason the rulers were called Lords of Gauḍa (गौडेश्वर). Even after the conquest of Bihār and of Lakṣmaṇāvatī (Varēndra) by Muḥammad-i-Bakhtiār, the other territories comprised in Gauḍa were ruled by the Sēna kings.

Minhāj writes:—

'When the latter (*i.e.*, Muḥammad-i-Bakhtiār) led his troops towards the mountains of Kāmrūd and Tirhut, he had despatched Muḥammad-i-shēran and his brother with a portion of his forces towards Lakhanōr and Jāj-nagar'. He states in another place—'Alī-i-Mardan proceeded to Diwkot and assumed the Government, and brought the *whole of the country of Lakṣmaṇāwatī under his sway.*' [2]

And prior to writing this, he had stated that it was this 'Alī-i-Mardan who in the year 602 Hijra, (1205 A. D.,) killed Muḥammad-i-Bakhtyār. Some time after this he went to Ghaznī accompanied by Sulṭān Kuṭbu-d-dīn Aibak. After remaining there as prisoner for some time he came back to Sulṭān Kuṭbu-d-dīn Aibak in Hindūstān, and the latter made over to him the territory of Lakhanāwatī. It is evident from the above that the whole of Lakhanāwatī, comprising Rāḍha and Varēndra came into the possession of 'Alī-i-Mardan at least 4 or 5 years after the murder of Muḥammad-i-Bakhtyār, *i. e.*, A.D. 1209—1210.

Minhāj states that Muḥammad Shēran had gone to conquer Lakhanōr, *i. e.*, Rāḍha and Jāj-nagar, the northern portion of Utkala; but up to 1209-1210 the Mussalmāns did not succeed in conquering the whole of Lakhanāwati It appears from this that Muḥammad-i-Shēran was defeated by Viçva-rūpa. After defeating the Musalmāns Viçva-rūpa assumed the name of '*Garga-yavanānvaya-pralaya-kāla-rudra*' (The terrible destroyer of the Yavana Dynasties, who sprang from Garga), and as at that time a portion of Utkala was under the sway of the kings of Bengal, they held the titles of Açva-pati, Gaja-pati, Nara-pati Rāja-trayādhipati, &c.

1 Raverty's *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, p. 585 and 588.

2 Raverty, *Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, p. 578.

From what has been stated above it may be inferred that in his old age Lakṣmaṇa-sēna made Mādhava-sēna the Governor of Rāḍha or Nava-dvīpa, and Kēçava-sēna that of Gauḍa (probably Varēndra). And in this manner Viçva-rūpa obtained the sovereignty of East Bengal. If the statement made by Ēḍū-miçra is to be taken as correct, we can infer from it that Kēçava-sēna, after repairing to East Bengal took shelter under Viçva-rūpa, who I believe, formally ascended the throne in A. D. 1200-1201.

In Çaka 1019, *i. e.*, A. D., 1097, Nānya-dēva of the Karṇāṭaka dynasty ruled in Nēpal. Dr. Kielhorn has shown that Vijaya-sēna defeated this king, and I accept the Doctor's statement as most probable. I have already shown that his (Vijaya-sēna's) son Ballāla-sēna was installed in the year A. D. 1119. Such being the case, Vijaya-sēna must have ruled Bengal for (at least) 24 or 25 years. After him Ballāla-sēna ruled 50 years, and his son Lakṣmaṇa-sēna 27 or 28 years.

Abū-l-faẓl has made mention of one Sadā-sēna [1] who ruled after Kēçava-sēna for a period of 18 years. I think that this Sadā-sēna probably ruled after Viçva-rūpa. It is not improbable that like the other rulers of Bengal, Viçva-rūpa also lived to an old age and reigned for many years. Abū-l-faẓl further says that after Sadā-sēna Naujā [2] ruled Bengal. Harimiçra has also made mention of a powerful king named Danaujā-mādhava. There is not the least shadow of doubt that Abū-l-faẓl read Naujā in place of Danaujā. In the work named Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz-shāhi, this Danaujā-mādhava, is described as Danuja Rāya. Dr. Wise has thus written of Danuja Rāya:—'This is probably the same person as Danujā-mādhava, who is believed to have been a grandson of Ballāla-sēna.' [3] This Danaujā-mādhava was not the grand-son, but the great-grandson of Ballāla-sēna. In speaking of Kēçava, Hari-miçra thus writes:—

प्रादुरभवत् धर्म्मात्मा सेनवंशादनन्तरम् ।
दनौजामाधवः सर्व्वभूपै सेव्यपदाम्बुजः ॥
एतत् सभायां बहव आगता ब्राह्मणा नराः ।
नानागुणसमायुक्ता द्वाविंशतिकुलोद्भवाः ॥
धनैश्च राजसम्मानैः पितामहजिगीषया ।
सम्बन्धं कृतवन्तश्च सर्व्वे भूधरपुङ्गवाः ॥ * * *
एते सर्व्वे महात्मानः सभायां लक्ष्मणस्य च ।
राज्ञः प्रतिष्ठिताः सर्व्वे प्रतिग्रहपराङ्मुखाः ॥

[1] Jarrett, *Āīn-i-Akbarī*, Vol. II. p. 146.
[2] Do. *Do.* " "
[3] *J. A. S. B.*, 1874, Pt. I. p. 83.

After this sprang Danaujā-mādhava from the Sēna dynasty. All kings of his time made obeisance to him. Several Brāhmaṇas, sprung from 22 families, and adorned with many good qualities, came to his court, and with the view of out-stripping his grand-father, Danaujā-mādhava established them in his kingdom, giving them wealth and the title of *Kaulīnya*......They were all established already at the Court of Lakṣmaṇa-sēna.

I have not been able to ascertain from the genealogies of ancient families whose son Danaujā-mādhava was. The Kārikā of Hari-miçra plainly shows that Kēçava-sēna was not his father. I am inclined to conjecture that Danaujā-mādhava of the Sēna family was the son of Sadā-sēna.

According to Ēḍū-miçra, Hari-miçra, Dhruvānanda, Mahēçvara and other genealogists, as also the old account of Kulācāryas of Ēdilpur, it was Danaujā-mādhava who reorganised Kulīnism among the Brāhmaṇas and Vaŋgaja Kāyasthas. Some of these Kārikās give the name of Danaujā-mādhava-dēva slightly altered, such as Danuja-mādhava-dēva, Danuja-mardana-dēva. But whether he was called Nauja, Danuja Rāya, Danaujā-mādhava, Danuja-mardana or Danuja-mādhava, there is no doubt that they all refer to the same individual.[1]

According to some of the Kārikās of Edilpur, this Danaujā-mādhava or Danuja-mardana issued orders about Kulīnism from Candra-dvīpa, and again the Ghaṭakas of Vikrama-pura say that the proclamation was made from Vikrama-pura. Moreover there is a tradition extant that a person named Danuja-mardana, after leaving Vikrama-pura went to Candra-dvīpa and there established a kingdom with the help of his spiritual guide. Dr. Wise has thus written of this dynasty :—

'It is not improbable that the founder of this family is the same person as the Rāi of Sunārgāõ, by name Danuj Rāi,[2] who met the Emperor Balban on his march against Sulṭan Mughīṣu-d-dīn in the year 1280. It is not likely that the Muḥammadan usurper would have allowed a Hindu to remain in independence at his capital Sunārgāõ. If the principality of Candra-dvīpa extended to the River Mēghnā, the agreement made with the Emperor that he would guard against the escape of Tughrīl to the west becomes intelligible.'

'The chief event, however, of his reign was the organisation of the Vaŋgaja Kāyasthas. He appointed certain Brāhmaṇs, whose descendants still reside at Edilpur ('Adilpur), to be Ghaṭakas or Kulācāryas of the Kāyasthas, and he directed that all marriages should be arranged by them, and that they should be responsible that the Kulīna Kāyasthas only intermarried with families of equal rank. He also appointed a Svarṇā-

[1] See *Viçva-kōṣa*, article '*Kulīna.*'

[2] Elliot's *Muhammadan Historians of India*, Vol. III. p. 116.

mātya, or master of the ceremonies, who fixed the precedence of each member of the Sabhā or assembly, and who pointed out the proper seat each individual was to occupy at the feast given by the Rājā. These officers still exist and the holders of them are much respected by all Kāyasthas.'[1]

It seems evident from the above that Lakṣmaṇa-sēna's grand-son, Danaujā Rāi or Danaujā-mādhava of Vikrama-pura, having been greatly annoyed by the Musalmāns, went to Candra-dvīpa and established a kingdom there. From the Kārikās of the Ghaṭakas of Candra-dvīpa, it would appear that after Danaujā-mādhava, his descendants Ramā-vallabha-dēva-rāya, Kṛṣṇa-vallabha-dēva-rāya, Hari-vallabha-dēva-rāya and Jaya-dēva-rāya ruled Candra-dvīpa one after another.[2] The last of the Sēna kings of Candra-dvīpa (Jaya-dēva) had no male issue. The oldest of the kārikās of the Ghaṭakas of Candra-dvīpa thus says:—

वलभद्रात्मजो धीमान् परमानन्दसंज्ञकः ।
तस्य मातामहः कृती जयदेवो महावली ॥
चन्द्रद्वीपस्य भूपालो देववंशसमुद्भवः ।
मृत्युकालं प्राप्य स हि ततः पञ्चत्वमागतः ।
परमानन्दकस्तस्मात् चन्द्रद्वीपेश्वरोऽभवत् ॥

Paramānanda the wise was Bala-bhadra's son, and the valiant Jaya-dēva was the grand-father of Paramānanda on the mother's side. Jaya-dēva belonged to the Dēva-family and was the king of Candra-dvīpa. On his demise, Paramānanda, as heir to the throne, ruled the kingdom.

A question may here arise that if Jaya-dēva and his predecessors belonged to the Sēna family, how is it that in the books of the Ghaṭakas of Candra-dvīpa they are spoken of as having sprung from the Dēva-family?[3] But the question is easy to answer. In all the inscriptions discovered from the time of Vijaya-sēna to that of Viçva-rūpa, the title 'dēva' is attached to the names of all the Sēna kings, and this accounts for the statement made by the Ghaṭakas.

In all the kārikās of the Ghaṭakas of Ēdilpur, it is mentioned, that Paramānanda-rāya, the first king of the Vasu family of Candra-dvīpa, son of Bala-bhadra-vasu, a first-class Kulīna of Dehurghāṭi, was Rājā Jaya-dēva's daughter's son. All these show conclusively that the

[1] *J. A. S. B.*, 1874, Pt. I, p. 206-7.

[2] Dr. Wise gives a similar Table, except that he omits the name of Hari-vallabha-dēva. *J. A. S. B.*, 1874, Pt. I, p. 207.

[3] Dēva means here divine or illustrious.

kingdom of Candra-dvīpa came to be ruled by the descendants of the daughter of Jaya-dēva.[1]

Abū-l-fazl thus writes of Candra-dvīpa, *i. e.*, Sarkār of Bāklā :—'In the 29th year of the Divine era, a terrible inundation occurred at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, which swept over the whole Sarkār. The Rājā held an entertainment at the time. He at once embarked on board a boat, while his son, Paramānanda-rāya with some others climbed to the top of a temple and a merchant took refuge on a high loft. For four hours and a half the sea raged amid thunder and a hurricane of wind. Houses and boats were engulfed, but no damage occurred to the temple or loft.'[2]

It would appear from Abū-l-fazl's statement that Paramānanda's father also was a king of Candra-dvīpa, and that Paramānanda escaped from the flood that took place in the 29th year of Akbar's reign, *i. e.* 1585 A. D. There is no doubt as to the deluge having occurred in the year quoted above; but according to the account of the Kulācārya-kārikās of Candra-dvīpa, Jagadānanda-rāya was the ruler at that time and the life of his son Kandarpa-nārāyaṇa was saved on the occasion.[3]

Especially, in the year after the occurrence of the deluge referred to, *i.e.*, 1586 A. D., Ralph Fitch, who came to this country, saw Kandarpa-nārāyaṇa, the grandson of Paramānanda on the throne.[4] Under such circumstances, more reliance should be placed on the genealogy of the royal dynasty of Candra-dvīpa than on what has been mentioned in the *Āīn-i-Akbarī*. According to the rules of inheritance, Paramānanda was heir to Jaya-dēva and not his father Bala-bhadra. It is probable that at the time of Jaya-dēva's death, Paramānanda was too young to take up the reins of government, and that in consequence his father directed the affairs of the state on his behalf.

According to the Tibetan author, Tārānātha, the close of the Sēna dynasty must have taken place in A. D. 1300. In my opinion, in that year the Sēna kings were only driven from Sunār-gāõ by the Muḥammadans. We see Danujā-rāya of Sunārgāõ helping Balban even in A.D. 1280. Under such circumstances it is more probable that 20 years from

[1] *J. A. S. B.*, 1874, Pt. I, p. 207.

[2] Jarrett's *Āīn-i-Akbarī*, Vol. II, p. 123.

[3] In the kārikā written by Dhruvānanda-miçra, Court-Poet of Rājā Prēma-nārāyaṇa of Candra-dvīpa, it is stated :—

तस्यात्मजः महाकृतिः जगदानन्दसंज्ञकः ।
गङ्गाध्यानं मृत्युकाले चकरोत् स नृपोत्तमः ॥
अस्तैतच्च सुरधुनी जलरूपा ततोऽभवत् ।
गृहीत्वा तं नृपवरं तत्रैवान्तरधीयत ॥
कन्दर्पोपमकन्दर्पो जगदानन्दकात्मजः ।

[4] Hackluyt's Voyages, Vol. II, p. 257; and *J. A. S. B.*, 1874, Pt. I, p. 207.

that occurrence, Danuja-rāya, being driven from Vikrama-pura or Suvarṇa-grāma, founded the kingdom of Candra-dvīpa.

In page 473 of his account of Bengal, Tieffenthaler adds that after Rājā Nodjā (Danaujā) there reigned seven Hindu princes whose names are not known and who ruled for 106 years. But I have already pointed out from the genealogy of the kings of Candra-dvīpa that after Nodjā or Danaujā four of his descendants ruled one after another, and the son of the last king's daughter inherited the kingdom. In all likelihood this change took place between the years 1440 and 1460 A. D. After seven members of the Vasu family had ruled Candra-dvīpa, the kingdom passed into the hands of the Mitra family, the sister's son of the last king having ascended the throne. At present the descendants of that dynasty are living at Mādhava-pāçā.[1] A genealogical table of the kings of the Sēna dynasty and of those of the Vasu and Mitra families that sprung from it, is given below:—

Hēmanta-sēna.
|
Vijaya-sēna-dēva, (circa 1097 A. D.)
|
Ballāla-sēna-dēva, (1119 A. D.)
|
Lakṣmaṇa-sēna-dēva (1170 A. D.)
|
Mādhava-sēna. — Kēçava-sēna. — (at Vikrama-pura) Viçva-rūpa-sēna-dēva (Circa 1200–1235?) — Sadā-sēna. (?)
|
Danaujā-mādhava-dēva (1280 A. D.)
[Founder of Candra-dvīpa]
(At Candra-dvīpa.)
|
Ramā-vallabha-dēva-rāya.
|
Kṛṣṇa-vallabha-dēva-rāya.
|
Hari-vallabha-dēva-rāya.
|
Jaya-dēva-rāya,
[Who had a daughter married to
Bala-bhadra, of Vasu family, his son]
|
Paramānanda-rāya.

[1] For a full account of the Candra-dvīpa-rāja-vaṁça, see Viçva-koṣa, Vol. V article 'Candra-dvīpa,' and Babu Braja-sundara Mitra's History of the Candra-dvīpa-Rāja-family.

Paramānanda-rāya.
|
Jagadānanda-rāya.
|
Kandarpa-nārāyaṇa-rāya (1586 A.D.)
|
Rāma-candra-rāya.
|
Kīrti-nārāyaṇa — Vāsudēva-nārāyaṇa-rāya.
|
Prēma-nārāyaṇa-rāya. — Daughter (married to Mitra family.)
|
Udaya-nārāyaṇa. — Rāja-nārāyaṇa.
|
Çiva-nārāyaṇa.
|
Jaya-nārāyaṇa.
|
Nṛsiṁha-nārāyaṇa.
|
Vīrasiṁha-nārāyan (adopted).
|
Dēvēndra-nārāyaṇa (adopted).
|
Son (still living).

Before we conclude this subject, we must clear up one point with regard to the Sēna kings having belonged to the Vaidya caste. There is a tradition extant that Ballāla-sēna of Vikrama-pura was a Vaidya. This tradition has sprung from the fact of there having been a Vaidya king of the same name. Gōpāla-bhaṭṭa in his work, 'Ballāla-carita' thus speaks of him :—

वैद्यवंशावतंसोऽयं बल्लालनृपपुङ्गवः ।
तदाज्ञया कृतमिदं बल्लालचरितं शुभम् ॥
गोपालभट्टनाम्ना च तद्राजशिक्षकेन च ।
अन्धराजजमाने वसुभिर्वाणैरधिकशाकेषु ।
रुद्रैश्च दर्शिते मासे राशिभिर्माससम्मिते ॥

This shows that in 1300 Çaka, *i.e.*, 1378 A.D., Gōpāla-bhaṭṭa, teacher of king Ballāla-sēna of the Vaidya family, wrote by order of the king a book called Ballāla-carita. It is well known that Ballāla-sēna, son of Vijaya-sēna, lived about 250 years previous to this, and that in the year

1378 almost the whole of Bengal came under the Musalmān rule. It is also stated in the 'Ballāla-carita,' that Ballāla of the Vaidya family, fought against a Musalmān Faqīr named Bābā Ādam.[1]

This shows conclusively that Ballāla of the Sēna family of Gauḍa was a Kāyastha or a Kṣatriya of the Lunar Dynasty, and that Ballāla of Vikrama-pura, who lived long after him, was a Vaidya. The latter, probably, was a Zamīndār of note, who at the time of dismemberment of the Kingdom of Bengal rose to some eminence.

POSTSCRIPT.

After I had finished the above article, I obtained from an old Ghaṭaka of Farīdpur, a Vaṁçāvali of the kings of Candra-dvīpa. This Vaṁçāvali in a verse clearly describes Jaya-dēva the 5th king of Candra-dvīpa, as descended from the Ṣēna dynasty. The Çlōka runs thus:—

तस्य मातामहः कृती जयदेवो महाबली ।
चन्द्रद्वीपस्य भूपालो सेनवंशसमुद्भवः ॥

From the above, there can be no doubt of Danaujā and his descendants being descended from the Sēna dynasty. Moreover I have heard from the old Ghaṭaka, that Danaujā and his successors styled themselves Rāyas of Candra-dvīpa.

[1] Cunningham, Rep. Arch. Sur., Vol. XV, p. 135: *J. A. S. B.*, Vol. LVIII, Pt. I, pp. 18-19.